

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 are now pending for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Claims 5-6 have been canceled, claims 1-4 have been amended to improve their form, and new claims 7-8 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brezmes (EP 2189915) in view of Delidais (US 2011/0314491).

Applicants traverse this rejection as the applied references would not have disclosed or taught at least the following features:

- (A) an identification information resolution server that:
- (1) receives identification information from a mobile terminal device;
  - (2) refers to the mapping table using time information and the identification information; and
  - (3) returns the address information of a corresponding content to the mobile terminal device when the time information is within the range of valid time indicated by the valid time information.

The applied references would not have taught an identification information resolution server that returns the address information when the identification information is valid based on the time information in the mapping table.

Indeed, in recognizing Brezmes failing to disclose or teach using time information that indicates the validity of the identification information, the examiner relies on Delidais for the missing features.

Applicants submit that the combination urged by the examiner still would not have taught the claimed feature (A) outlined above because Delidais' paragraph 44 merely discloses the mobile device transferring a record log to a server:

[0044] ... For example, the trigger may have an advertiser identifier, an advertisement identifier, a number of points or amount of credit available in exchange for a click and a time limit or validity window within which the viewer has to register his click. The interface would then generate an application which displays a graphic showing said advertiser's logo and inviting the viewer to click on it. After an amount of time indicated by the validity window, the graphic would disappear ... At some point in time, the record log is transferred to the server, ... .

Specifically, even if the multimedia unit were deemed to correspond to a mobile terminal device and the server to correspond to an identification information resolution server for argument's sake, applicants submit that Delidais at best merely would have taught the mobile terminal device determining whether the identification information is valid or not based on the time window. Delidais does not teach the server determining the validity. In this respect, applicants submit that the combination urged by the examiner would not have disclosed or taught the claimed feature (A) outlined above.

In view of the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

28 AUGUST 2015

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150  
ASHBURN, VA 20147  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)  
LYLEKIMMS@RKMLLP.COM (EMAIL)